

appointed special prosecutor was already contemplating filing a court brief on behalf of Paula Jones and who had indicated he was planning to join Pepperdine Law School, an institution financed in large part by a person who has contributed millions of dollars to try to bring down the President. Mr. Starr from all reports is a fine, upstanding human being. But a person of his partisan and ideological mind-set should in my view never have been appointed to a position that calls for, above all, unquestioned fairness, balance and judgment. President Clinton is the second person. Up to this point he has been the most personally talented politician of his generation. He appears to be a person of good heart and courage who wants to do good things for the country. But it has often been noted in the press that the President's causes have been both promoted and crippled by a tendency to use language in ways that are technically in conformance with the truth but often result in obscuring rather than clarifying.

As frustrating as I feel about parsing of language in this episode, I am even more unhappy about the lack of candor demonstrated by both the President and congressional leaders in jointly obscuring the real effect of the budget agreement they both sold to the Nation last year on our ability to meet our domestic responsibilities in strengthening education, health, environment, housing and social service. Why does that frustrate me more? Because the second was a public event which had direct, substantive consequences for American citizens and their families on questions that we will be voting on every day.

At this point, some things are clear to me and some things are not. I cannot really reach a final judgment on this depressing matter until I have had an opportunity to have all of the appropriate information. But my first impressions are these. First, after four years and the expenditure of over \$40 million since Mr. Starr was first appointed to review the facts surrounding the Whitewater land deal in Arkansas in the 1970s, we still have no finding of illegal conduct by the President in Whitewater, no finding of illegal conduct by the President in the investigation of the White House travel office which Mr. Starr subsequently undertook, no finding of illegality by the President on the matter relating to the FBI file case. At this point all of the Nation is focused on something which had not even occurred when Mr. Starr was first appointed independent prosecutor.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I intended to comment on some of the concerns I had about both Mr. Starr and the President, but I am precluded by the Speaker's guidelines from doing so. The complete text of what I had to say on this point will also be available in my office, but I will not address them here.

As we ask the question, what is the proper action for Congress to now take, I will say that this episode in many ways is very different than Watergate. The actions in Watergate involved burglarizing and wiretapping political opponents, attempting to use the IRS to intimidate political opponents, financial payoffs to defendants in criminal cases, and other uses of the levers of governmental power to subvert the very democratic processes that underlie the essence of America. In considering an appropriate action for the Congress to take, I would urge the House to consider the course it took in another case a year earlier. At this point, what is important for us to determine is what is the best thing for the country. A congressional reprimand or other sanction may prove to be the most appropriate action, especially if it allows Congress to end this matter in a much shorter period of time so that the Congress and the presidency can refocus our attention and activities from issues of the past to the future public needs of the Nation and the people we are supposed to represent. I do not know how this sad chapter will end, but I do know that this episode and the way it has been handled by the leadership circles of our major institutions demonstrates a desperate need to examine how we can renew those crucial institutions.

In two years, the millennium will draw to a close. This Nation's institutions are simply not ready to lead the country into a new one. I would never in three lifetimes call for a new constitutional convention, because this generation of political leadership in my judgment is highly unlikely to improve on the work of the Founding Fathers. It is much more likely to muck it up. But I do believe we need to have millennium conventions convened for the purpose of examining ways to reshape, redirect and refocus almost all of our institutions, economic, corporate, political, communication, religious and even our international institutions, such as the IMF, the U.N. and NATO. In the political arena, we need special attention paid to the presidential nominating process to try to find ways to reduce the importance of candidates' media skills and increase the role of peer review by people who know the candidates best if both parties are to produce candidates with the qualities necessary to lead this country.

I do not know how we can change the human heart, but we do need to find ways to reshape the major institutions of this society so that there are more incentives to produce a new focus on selflessness. That is the major task we each face as individuals on life's journey. We need more help and less hindrance from the institutions that dominate our lives along the way.

#### ISSUES SURROUNDING REPORT OF INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, like most if not all Republicans in the House, I have refrained from making speeches or public statements about the current scandal gripping the White House. I have said on numerous occasions that there are more important issues I would rather the public focus on, like, for example, using American technology to upgrade Communist Chinese rockets, thus putting millions of American lives at risk of nuclear incineration. That is something I would like the American people to pay attention to. I would rather see investigative journalists tracking down the details of Communist Chinese money that was laundered into the last presidential campaign. I never did understand how those impoverished Buddhist monks ever got those \$5,000 checks to turn over to the President's reelection effort. We never did find that out, did we? I wonder where that came from.

Anyway, there are other things that are much more important than the current scandal that seems to be gripping onto everybody's attention. We Republicans have done our best to let the Starr investigation run its course without adding to the shrillness of the voices heard throughout the land.

□ 2230

Most of us honestly believe that it is a tragedy that a young lady who asked for an apology for ungentlemanly conduct did not get those words of apology that she sought, and had that happened, had she received the apology she was looking for, there would have been no civil case, there would have been no depositions, there would have been no lying under oath, there would have been no need to seek information to see if the offending actions were or were not part of a pattern of personal abuse. This country would have been spared all the humiliation and the spectacle of it all. Well, except for the fact that arrogance came to play and there was a refusal to apologize for offensive behavior. But for that, this thing would have gone away.

But this disgusting scenario has played itself out, and it has been all too public, and it has played itself out without the prodding of Republican Members of Congress. We have, for the most part, tried to maintain decorum, we have tried to maintain our position so that, if necessary, we would be ready to deal with the worst eventuality if we were called to make judgments.

One of the most respected leaders of this body admired by Republicans and Democrats alike is HENRY HYDE, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. He, more than any other, has attempted to remain aloof from the bitter rhetoric and accusatory language

that swirls throughout the land due to this ever growing scandal.

Today many of us were horrified to hear that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) was the target of a vicious personal attack and that that personal attack has all the appearances of an effort to intimidate not only Mr. HYDE, but other Members of Congress.

Upset with Mr. HYDE's leadership even before the hearings begin, a media outlet saw fit to disclose an indiscretion, an affair Mr. Hyde committed 30 years ago.

The smearing of Republican Congresswoman HELEN CHENOWETH disclosing an indiscretion of 15 years ago, and now the trashing of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, HENRY HYDE, is a blackmail message to every member of Congress. It is an ugly and possibly illegal tactic designed to cower Republicans.

Yes, no one is perfect, no one in this body is perfect, either Republicans or Democrats; we understand that. And there is no jury in the world that ever goes to try someone in court which is composed of perfect individuals either. But there is a difference between an indiscretion or something that someone has an imperfection, and there is a big difference between that and lying under oath and asking others to lie under oath in order to thwart a civil suit that was itself a product of misconduct.

The vicious attack on Mr. HYDE underscores that the issue at hand in Washington is the abuse of power, of arrogance and of a willingness to act without shame in having one's own way.

Those people who pushed this story of a 30-year-old indiscretion have strengthened the resolve of the Republicans to stand tough. Not one of us is perfect, or not one of us has, you know, has a situation where we do not have something in our past that we would prefer not to be made public. But we will not be intimidated.

Years ago in the Nixon administration Charles Colson, a legal counsel to the President, showed one-half of one FBI file to a journalist. That file contained derogatory information about a critic of the administration. For that repulsive and undemocratic personal attack Mr. Colson was convicted of a felony and sent to Federal prison.

Now we all know that in this administration hundreds of FBI files made their way into the hands of a democratic opposition researcher who was on the White House staff. No one has ever been held accountable for these hundreds of FBI files that were so abused. And an enormous effort was made to throw dust into the air and confuse the issue and obscure it from public scrutiny until it was forgotten, just like perhaps those \$5,000 checks from those Buddhist monks are now forgotten or just a distant memory.

By the way, whatever happened to those things? Whatever happened to the FBI files? Who was accountable for

that? These are things that have never been answered, but it is forgotten now because so much dust is in the air.

We have seen from this administration a willingness to destroy any adversary, far beyond anything that Richard Nixon ever dreamed of. Richard Nixon, yes, had an enemies list. It was a list of names with whom the White House would not cooperate. These were people who, the enemies list were people who would not be invited to luncheons or to special briefings or given any special type of treatment. That is what the enemies list was under Richard Nixon.

This administration seems to have a hit list of people who are targeted for personal character assassination. Paula Jones was mistreated and then disparaged and brutalized for asking for an apology. Now we see attacks on Members of Congress. DAN BURTON was investigating, Congressman DAN BURTON was investigating, campaign corruption, had nothing to do with any other personal things that are going on, any other scandals that are going on, but he was investigating campaign corruption, and his own personal shortcomings of long ago were rubbed in his face. He, too, will not be intimidated. He, too, is standing tough.

The public does not expect us to be perfect, it does not expect it. Does not expect DAN BURTON to be perfect, does not expect me to be perfect, does not expect any Republican Member or any Democrat Member to be perfect because none of us are. But it is not hypocrisy for those of us who are not perfect to look into the abuses of power, to look into felony obstruction of justice, or perjury, of lying under oath, and we should be able to do that without someone threatening to disclose some information about an indiscretion of years ago.

It appears that the House of Representatives may soon be called upon to judge evidence and make determinations. Any attempt to blackmail or intimidate us, to make us cower for fear of personal embarrassment, will not work. And if it is found that these attacks can in any way be traced to those under investigation, it will be the last straw.

The American people are tolerant, sometimes to a fault. They are long suffering and slow to anger. But those who would tamper with the jury, blackmail and intimidate and conduct the most vicious type of personal attack on one's adversaries, will feel the wrath of the American people and will unify this Congress. On both sides of the aisle we will come together because we believe, as Members of this body, that this is an American institution that is dedicated to the proposition that we are better than that, better than they that do things in other more totalitarian, less democratic countries. We are better than that here in the United States of America, and in the capital and in the Congress of the United States we will hold to a higher standard.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of utmost importance. It took my breath away today when I heard that HENRY HYDE had been attacked in this way. As I say, we had seen this with HELEN CHENOWETH and DAN BURTON before. We had seen critics of the administration suffer these type of personal attacks, and we have heard stories of things that happened in the past to critics, and it is something that goes beyond the bounds.

This cannot be tolerated. It is a crossing of the line. Mr. HYDE is a well-respected, a very well-respected Member of this body, and not only have they shown they can do this to Mr. HYDE, but they have done this to others, and they can do to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary this? If we let this go by, it is just admitting that our standards of our country have sunk to that level, and we cannot let that happen, and I would yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I would say tonight, ladies and gentlemen who join us here in this Chamber and those who watch these words coast to coast and beyond through the facilities of C-Span and other satellite networks, that sadly a scourge has descended on this Federal capital district, on this capital city, a scourge borne of a cynicism, a scourge borne of a scorched earth policy. And, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I think it is important to note some basics at this hour of need in our Nation.

First and foremost, every Member of this body, as well as those who serve in elective capacity within the Executive Branch and those in the Judiciary, take an oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. And at this hour in this place at a time of grave national concern we would do well to remember the words of our founders in Article 2, Section 4, when it comes to discussion of the Executive Branch. Our founders write, and I quote:

The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Those are the words of our founders. Those are the words of the document which Katherine Drinker Bowen characterized as the miracle at Philadelphia. Those are the words to which we took an oath of office to protect, uphold and defend.

And I share my colleague from California's amazement and outrage that in this city, at this time, there are those who would pursue a scorched earth policy to try and convince the American people that, quote, everybody does it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, no. Everyone does not do it.

□ 2115

Everyone does not lie under oath. After making a promise to God, after

making a promise to the citizens of this nation, after swearing an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, at long last, have they no dignity? Have they no sense of honor?

Those who through the media and who through whispered comments and who through telephone calls would besmirch the dignity of those who serve in this branch under the cynical and sick notion that everyone does it, Mr. Speaker, I give the American people far more credit.

I understand the burdens that confront the average American family. Indeed, we have seen it here and my colleague from California will attest, I have come to this well, as has he, and as have others, to point out that the median American family today surrenders well over a quarter of its income in taxes to the Federal Government as opposed to the median American family in 1948.

I understand the workload that confronts moms and dads around this country, where one spouse chooses to work not voluntarily but out of necessity, to pay the tax bill.

I understand the stresses and strains on average Americans simply to pay their taxes and to feed and educate and clothe their children and yet I understand what our founders meant in this document. Let there be no mistake, to those cynics who offer the tactics of smear and fear, the citizens of this great country and those who serve in this body will not be intimidated. Freedom has come at far too great a price.

The Constitution is far too valuable for those peddlers of petty gossip to sustain a position of supremacy.

Mr. Speaker, their actions speak clearly. They have no decency. They hold no harbor for the rule of law, and they certainly fail to adhere to the edicts of the Constitution, but our founders, in their prescience, in their foresight, in their resolve, offered constitutional remedies to this House and to this nation. No one approaches these remedies with glee, for our oath is to the Constitution, not to partisan political advantage.

As my colleague from California points out, the peddlers of gossip, cynicism and despair continue to wage their sinister tactics.

Would that it were not so. Would that we could come to this chamber to discuss policy differences, earnestly held, sincerely championed. Yet, even though there are grave concerns that confront this nation, from the concept of providing for the common defense, as my colleague from California pointed out, to the challenge of making sure that American families hold on to more of their hard-earned money and send less of it to Washington, even with those pressing concerns, not to mention the concerns of education that confront every family, there is no more pressing need, Mr. Speaker, than to champion the adherence to the rule of law in this constitutional republic, at

this time, in this place, Mr. Speaker, the most hallowed of American institutions.

To those, Mr. Speaker, who would weave a cynical web of gossip and cynicism, we say, shame, shame on your cynical tactics, shame on your crawling into the gutter, shame on your cheap, reprehensible notions that you can claim simply that everyone does it.

For, Mr. Speaker, even though as I stand as a human, as the Apostle Paul said, all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God. Even as we understand the difference between mistakes, so, too, Mr. Speaker, do we note the distinction of crimes. If we are to suggest that, one, for whatever reason, is excused from the oath before God and man, not of high office but simply to tell the truth in interpersonal matters, then we have abandoned the rule of law and we have surrendered that which makes this constitutional republic the last best hope of mankind. It transcends party. It transcends personality. It goes to the core of what it means to be an American.

Mr. Speaker, again, to those who would crawl into the gutter, who would whisper to the magazine writers, who would whisper to the television journalists, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity and all humility I must ask, have they no shame? At long last, have they no shame?

Worse, Mr. Speaker, have they no reverence for our constitutional republic and the concept of freedom, which is every American's, conditional upon the rule of law?

These are not tranquil times. No matter the Dow Jones industrial average, no matter the rate of return in the bond market, if we face a crisis of personal integrity in the social will to tell the truth, then we indeed face a crisis. If we continue to hear from the punditocracy that the rule of law makes no difference, then we confront a crisis as grave as the missiles that may be aimed at us, a crisis of spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I reject that notion. I know full well from hearing from the constituents of the Sixth District of Arizona, to whom I have listened in the past few months, in knowing of the concerns of my colleague and others on both sides of the aisle, we know full well what is at stake and we heap disdain on those who would try to change the subject through cheap gossip.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would like to stay we can have a colloquy on this. I would just like to point a few things out.

I worked in the White House for 7 years under Ronald Reagan, and I worked in all of his presidential campaigns. I was very close to President Reagan. I was, in fact, a speech writer for President Reagan and special assistant to the President and was privy to many, many internal discussions about how to confront various challenges to the administration.

At no time during my many, many years with Ronald Reagan did I ever

hear anyone ever suggest that we launch some type of personal attack on an adversary, especially dealing with Congress, especially dealing with the chairman of a committee like the Committee on the Judiciary. At no time did I ever hear a suggestion in the Reagan White House that we should leak some negative information about somebody's personal life to a reporter. Never did I hear that.

In the 10 years since I have been here, let me just say, even the most aggressive fights that we have had on the floor here of the House of Representatives, never has anyone from the other side of the aisle or anyone on this side of the aisle that I have heard of, talked about, well, let us get that person by leaking some personal information about them, about some indiscretion they had years ago or some sort of personal problem that they might have. It just does not happen.

We have a comity here that speaks well of democracy. There has to be a certain degree of goodwill in democracy. Those standards of goodwill and comity are especially important at times of crises as we are now facing in the Nation's capital.

I never heard it when I worked at the White House and I have not heard it here but yet today we hear, after hearing stories of the gentlewoman from Idaho (HELEN CHENOWETH) of 15 years ago, the gentleman from Indiana (DAN BURTON) of long ago and now the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has had some indiscretion he committed 30 years ago made public.

It is a message to all of us here. It is a message to say, either go along or we are going to find something on you.

We have a Member of our body here, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCHALE), who was on television and announced that he was no longer supporting the President's position in terms of this scandal.

What happened? People tried to leak negative information. Geraldo Rivera on TV tried to bring up some negative personal story about the man that proved to be false. The story itself was incorrect. Even if it was correct, is this the right tactic to use to try to bludgeon people into submission and not to criticize?

Now, when I was a reporter, I was a reporter for about 10 years, that is my profession, I am a writer, and during that time period, we journalists, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) spoke about journalism before he came here, before we got up and talked about people who have to say negative things about other people, but not all journalists are that way. A lot of times, it is not relevant.

Sometimes personal things are relevant, and they are brought out and they are not just brought out for a mean spirited thing. It is because they are relevant. I remember when someone came to me when I was a journalist in Los Angeles and talked about a public figure, an office holder in the Democratic Party, who had been arrested,

when he was very young, in some kind of a homosexual act.

They said, this is going to be a big story and you are going to have a chance to break it. This was not the Republican Party, I might add, who was telling me this. I will not go into who it was but it was not someone associated with the Republican Party and it was not a Republican Party office holder. In fact, it was another journalist.

I said, no, I am not going to do this. This was long ago and this has no relationship to this person today and I am just not going to do that. That story never did come out, because I am sure that that story probably went to several other journalists in Los Angeles. I can say right now if that would have been a conservative Republican that story would have come out, and the message from some of the things that are happening right now is that if someone goes up against the President on this issue, they are going to get it.

Now, whoever is going to be dishing it out, we do not know who it is but the message is there. When we have someone of the stature of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), who is dragged through the mud, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is beloved on both sides of the aisle, he is respected on both sides of the aisle, integrity does not mean that you are a perfect human being. Jesus Christ was a perfect human being, but that is the only person I know that ever traipsed upon the earth that is a perfect human being.

To instead of argue a case, instead of arguing the merits of one's position, to go after people like this and to disclose embarrassing information and just to get up here and say this and to challenge this, of course, opens me up to that kind of attack and if we try to get together and do something tomorrow, every one of us will know that we are opening ourselves up to that kind of an attack, but I will state right now for the record, and I am sure my colleague from Arizona will agree, that these tactics will not intimidate the Members of the House of Representatives.

□ 2300

I think it will draw us closer. I think the Members of the Democratic side of the aisle will reject and they will condemn this type of practice and will, in doing so, be drawn closer to those of us on this side of the aisle and our commitment to have an honest hearing of all of the facts that will come to us and make an honest decision. For whatever decision we are called upon to make, we are going to have an honest decision.

Now, we have held our tongues and have not used this floor as a means to manipulate or attack or to use for political purposes this scandal that has been sweeping through our country. We have tried our best, and sometimes we slip a little bit because it is of interest, but we are trying our best. And for

some to suffer this kind of personal abuse, and to see a hero, one of our heroes, and by the way, I have had my disagreements with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) too. I had a big fight with him, and my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) was on my side in that fight on the patent issue.

But even in the middle of that fight, I remember how much I respected the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as I hear my colleague from California recount honest policy differences, I am struck by the words of that great and good man, Dwight David Eisenhower, the supreme allied commander in Europe, and later the President of the United States who, Mr. Speaker, instructed all of us, all of us when we have a political dispute, to understand that those who might hold differing views honestly want what is best for the country. This is the distinction we draw tonight, Mr. Speaker.

To those small-minded, sinister, purveyors of the perverse, we say tonight, Mr. Speaker, shame. Shame on you and your tactics. Shame on you and what you attempt to do. For in your attempt, you bankrupt any innovative policy of those who have chosen to stray from constitutional guidelines, those have chosen to stray from the conduct of simple human decency, and those who may have chosen to stray from the rule of law.

That is the statement we make tonight, well aware that those small and sinister minds may work overtime with journalists of their choosing and publications of their philosophy to try and lower us to the muck and mire, and yet Ike's example is there for every American.

To quote the former President and a member of the other body in bygone times, "I am not going to climb into the gutter with that guy," said President Eisenhower. And those of us of both parties join in the example of Ike to say, no, it is not time to climb into the gutter. Instead, it is a time to champion the truth, the constitutional remedies at our disposal for the people, because principle outstrips polling and outstrips malicious gossip any day at any time, and especially in this place.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman brought up Eisenhower. I think it would be interesting to those reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, listening over C-SPAN and our colleagues who are listening at home and in the body, to note a quotation from Adlai Stevenson.

Mr. Speaker, Eisenhower and Stevenson fought a very tough battle for the presidency, not on 1 occasion, but on 2 occasions. And Adlai Stevenson is quoted as saying, my favorite quote from Mr. Stevenson is, "He who throws mud will generally lose ground."

I am afraid that those people who have launched these personal attacks

on the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWITH) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and now the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, those people who have tried to destroy Paula Jones when she was asking for an apology for ungentlemanly conduct that was thrown at her, that those people will not be tolerated by other members of the media and other Members of this body. I think that especially now, this attack on the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), tomorrow we will see that our colleagues will rally to the gentleman from Illinois, and we will tomorrow reconfirm to one another that that is unacceptable, and that there shall be no more of this, and that this indeed may be the last straw, but if this tactic continues, and if this tactic is traced back to anyone who is under investigation, that that will be the last straw.

There are reports, there are some reports right now that this may well have been something that came out of this White House. Again, just like the charges that we were asked to investigate, let us wait and see. I am not going to state that that is the case because all I have done is hear some television reports. But if the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), as the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is faced with some sort of conspiratorial action to have a personal, a vile personal attack against him to disclose some information from 30 years ago, while we are trying to investigate, and again, trying to investigate charges of what? Charges that someone lied under oath, charges that someone has asked other people to lie under oath and things such as that, if we cannot look into this seriously and take that job seriously without having it threatened, that we are in some way going to have some little thing that we have done wrong, and all of us have done things that are embarrassing in our lives, then we have let the standards slip.

This is the United States of America. We are supposed to be better than that here.

There was a movie a few years ago, I do not know if my friend remembers that movie, and it was about somewhere here in Washington, and I think it was the President's choice of a certain ambassadorial job or something, and some personal information was leaked about that person that he had had some homosexual affair or something like that, and the man ended up committing suicide. I forget what the name of that movie is right now. Advice and Consent, that is exactly what it was.

In that movie, I think that it really brought home for those of us who had never been in Washington, when I first saw that I had never been in Washington, and of course it was a wonderful book by Mr. Drury, was it? What that brought home was the fact that we are people here. We are human beings, and we have feelings, and certainly we get

mad and angry. I know I got mad today and said a couple of things to somebody I did not want to say.

But this was not an action of anger. What we are talking about is the activity taken against the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) was cold and calculated and as low as one can get in this town. We are supposed to be above that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, indeed, those tactics, Mr. Speaker, are tactics of desperation and depravity, for they fail to make the moral distinction between mistakes, sins, and possible crimes. There is a clear distinction in our society, especially for the latter category. That is why for over 200 years we in this constitutional republic have had an adherence to the rule of law. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are those who, through their scurrilous actions, would try to muddy the waters, try to change the distinctions, try to mitigate the circumstances for what could possibly be crimes.

Let us state clearly and unequivocally, Mr. Speaker, for those who join us in this chamber; for those who may watch around the world, a failure to tell the truth under oath is a crime. Not a mistake, not an indiscretion simply, and not simply a sin. It is a crime.

□ 2310

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is the crux of what confronts us at this time, in this place, in this city, and indeed across the Nation.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we of course are seeing that is what the issue is. That is to be determined. We are not saying right now that a crime has been committed.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Indeed.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. But what we are saying is that that is what the underlying tension in this city today is as we are moving forward to investigate a crime. We have done everything that we can do.

My colleagues have not seen me on the floor, and my colleagues have not seen the gentleman from Arizona on the floor. We both would like to speak, and we are politically oriented. We are in the middle of the year. My colleagues have not seen some of the other great, great speakers on the Republican side of the aisle down in the well and making political hay out of this. We are not.

We have not been doing that because we know that that this body has to determine, as the gentleman showed in the Constitution, it is up to us to uphold that standard and determine if a crime has been committed.

God will judge people's sin and morals. It is up to us to make that judgment if a crime has been committed. To have in the middle of this now, to have this word go out that anybody who gets too tough, even the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is going to find themselves the subject of

a smear. Anything they have ever done wrong is going to be spread all over the newspapers.

This is unconscionable. We cannot let that be the standard here in Washington, D.C. This is all we are really talking about is upholding the standards, the standards that were written down by our Founding Fathers in that Constitution.

There is a lot of talk about moral standards, and I think that is an important issue of discussion; that is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about the law.

By the way, if a simple apology would have been made to someone who was mistreated, and that is all that person was really asking for, everything else had been decided, this need not have come to a head. There did not need to be depositions. There did not need to be someone to be asked an investigation to find out if this kind of conduct was something that was a personal habit that was going on, an ongoing thing rather than just one little incident. That would not have been necessary then.

The lying under oath and trying to protect oneself, it would not have happened except the fact that somebody did not get an apology when they asked for it because they were a simple person, just a simple person who believed that she had been treated not like a lady.

In this country, even a simple person has a right. No matter who that other individual is, no matter what high office they may hold, they cannot treat a citizen in a way without legal recourse.

One note. In Los Angeles, I remember the story of an Arab, rich Arab Sheikh that came into town and had lots of money. He was a king or something. Maybe he was a prince or whatever he was. He was a pretty big shot in his own country.

He checked into a hotel, and the bellman was late with delivering something by 5 minutes or something, and this man slapped the bellman. The bellman looked at him and he said, you cannot do that. This is the United States of America. He said, you are a bellman. He said, get out of here.

No, in the United States of America, that bellman has the rights and can have his dignity protected just like that young lady, Paula Jones, had a right to have her dignity protected.

If that prince would have apologized, it probably would have been okay. But he did not, and he was arrogant. In the end, that prince, worth hundreds of millions of dollars, perhaps billions of dollars, had to flee this country because of a civil suit filed by that bellman.

I am proud to live in the United States of America where these people are protected. But it is only the rule of law that protects them. It is only a certain amount of respect that we have for the average person.

Yes, when the average person sues the high and mighty, there are deposi-

tions that have to be taken and people have to give testimony under oath in order to investigate personal conduct that may prove that there is some kind of a pattern, a personal pattern in that abuse.

If someone lies during that civil matter, that is a violation of the law. We have to determine whether the law has been violated, whether that happened in this case. We take that seriously.

I am not saying I am in favor of impeachment or if I believe that there is any crime that absolutely has been committed, but we can say that there is enough evidence for us to look into this matter, and we must look into this matter without outside pressures trying to intimidate us to back away or to cower because someone's going to say something bad about our background. It is wrong.

What happened to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) was wrong. What happened to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) was wrong. What happened to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) was wrong.

We are not going to let it happen. We are not going to be intimidated. We are not going to let that happen. We are going to find out whether this could be traced back to the people who are under investigation. We are going to find that out.

Again if it is, if this can be traced back to the person under investigation, this is the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California for yielding to me. I would simply stand in support of all that he has said. It is important to make the distinction between charges and crimes. I thank him for that distinction.

I thank the gentleman also, Mr. Speaker, for explaining in his own unique fashion the creed that is inscribed on the magnificent temple of law across the street here in Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker. For outside the chamber of the Supreme Court of the United States, as one gazes at that edifice, one sees the words "Equal Justice Under Law."

Who among us would alter that notion? Who among us, Mr. Speaker, would perverse or pervert that dynamic, that all who live in this Nation, that all who are blessed with citizenship in this constitutional republic are equal under law? That is the question that confronts us, not the high jinks or tomfoolery or gossip that accompanies the charges that are there, but, instead the simple notion, Mr. Speaker, that no one, no one, no prince, no potentate, no President is above the law.

For in this constitutional republic, if we abandon that notion, then one should simply take a match to this document or tear it asunder. For the rule of law will crumble as will this last best hope of mankind.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let me just note this, if the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) was being accused of perjury and saying that he had committed perjury in the past, how can he now investigate and have a perjury investigation? If the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) was being accused of obstruction of justice, that would be something else. We probably would say maybe there is a point here, and someone has a built-in situation where he should not be that chairman or something.

That is not what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), what they brought up. That is not what they brought up on the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Let us say that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) had been accused of all sorts of campaign violations, and of course he is looking into campaign violations himself, these things.

□ 2320

These things, hypocrisy is something that someone can talk about and charge with someone. Someone has a double standard and things such as that. But that is not what has happened here. And, of course, we do know that Mr. Starr, and I have not personally commented on this. This is the first time that I have publicly commented on this. That Mr. Starr, of course, the investigator himself, has been brutalized over and over and again these last few years.

When I was in the Reagan White House, Ronald Reagan was committed to seeing that the communists would not take over Central America. And as much as people do not like to admit that, that was the core issue that was going on. Ronald Reagan was going to stop the Sandinista government, which had billions of dollars of military equipment from the Soviet Union, from expanding and put them on the defensive.

We did that until the Soviet Union collapsed. Because had the Sandinistas started expanding their role, it would have been a terrible thing. Probably communism would not have collapsed because they would have thought they were going to win.

Anyway there were some mistakes made by people in the White House and elsewhere, and we helped the Contras at a time when some Members of Congress felt that it was not legal for us to do so. Let me add, I personally believe that no laws were ever broken in that situation. I personally believe that it was perfectly legal for the President to, although it was not advisable what he did in terms of Iran, but it was perfectly legal for him to try to make those contacts with Iran and there was residual money that was left over that was then transferred to the Contras.

Mr. Speaker, that was a big crisis in the Reagan administration. That was as big as a crisis and upsetting of the natural order of things here as what we

are going through now, based on this current scandal. But at no time do I remember that the special prosecutor in that case, that we tried to do anything like is being done to Mr. Starr to the special prosecutor that went after Mr. Reagan.

And, by the way, that special prosecutor spent more money and had more people working for him, I believe, or at least an equal amount, and a number of people, and I do not remember seeing anything in the paper about whether seeing if people believed in the special prosecutor's words as they do now. They have polling as, "Who do you believe? Clinton or Starr?" That did not happen during the Reagan years.

I think Mr. Starr, and believe me, I do sympathize somewhat with the idea that prosecutors should not just have a blank slate and be able to come in and investigate anything in anybody's life until they find something. I understand that. But that is not what the situation is today. We have some specific things that we have to decide here, very specific things about specific statements made under oath that we believe that may well not have been truthful.

Mr. Speaker, we have to investigate that because it was made under oath and involving a civil legal matter. If we do not say that, we just say across the board that it is okay to lie under oath in civil cases. Now we cannot say that. We cannot permit that standard to sink that low.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). The Chair must remind members not to discuss charges against the President.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have not mentioned the President when discussing any particular charge. And in fact, some of the charges, some of the things that we have been discussing have no relationship to the President whatsoever. And, in fact, relate more perhaps to some of the President's staff or perhaps to other people in the executive branch. Or perhaps some of the things that we are discussing are aimed more at people who are liberal activists in the news media.

So, although obviously some of the things we are discussing may have some impact on the President, we are not addressing this specifically at the President.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, lest there be any doubt, we come to this Chamber, and indeed in the next few trying weeks this should be our cause. This, Mr. Speaker, should be our mission not to address the impending crisis as Republicans or as Democrats, but as Americans. Americans concerned about the future of the rule of law. Americans who understand that our adherence to the rule of law is both central and elemental to our survival in a constitutional republic. Adherence to the rule of law for all, regardless of title, regardless of job, regardless of economic standing, regardless of race,

religion, color or creed. This is the essence of what it means to be an American in the late 20th century. To understand that adherence to rule of law is everything. For if we lose that, then, Mr. Speaker, we have nothing. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. In conclusion, let me say that I am pleased that my friend from Arizona joined me here tonight. Actually I am sure he saw me on C-SPAN and decided to come over, working late in his office. He was probably working in his office after 11 o'clock at night and came over here, and I know that has happened to me at times as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are both concerned, and I think that tomorrow that we will see in this body a great deal of concern about this vicious personal attack on the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). And I would hope that it is a source of unity for this body, that we unify tomorrow and say that this is over. This is beyond the pale. This is over the bounds of acceptability. And we will stand together to uphold the standards of law because that is true, both Democrats and Republicans, we realize that like in that movie about the young boys who were on the island, remember that? Somebody else is going to have to help me with this. Lord of the Flies, in that movie Lord of the Flies, I remember I read the book as well, come to think of it. There was a conch that was the symbol of respect for law. But once that respect for whoever held that conch so the people would be quiet and listen to them and they could discuss the issues, once that was destroyed, there was a degeneration into a type of life, a savagery that came out. We will maintain the comity of this body. We will maintain goodwill. Goodwill among free people, goodwill among people who believe in democracy and constitutional government.

What happened with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) was not in keeping with that spirit, and it will not, and let us just state once and for all, we will not be intimidated. Justice will be served. We will make an honest determination of everything that comes before us and personal attacks on us must stop and they will not be tolerated.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

June 16, 1998

H.R. 824, An act to redesignate the Federal building located at 717 Madison Place, NW., in the District of Columbia, as the "Howard T. Markey National Courts Building."

H.R. 3565, An act to amend Part L of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.